UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/520,039	04/25/2005	Holger Klapproth	Micronas.7837	9248

50811 7590 05/14/2008
O'SHEA, GETZ & KOSAKOWSKI, P.C.
1500 MAIN ST.
SUITE 912
SPRINGFIELD, MA 01115

EXAMINER	
SALMON, KATHERINE D	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1634	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/14/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/520,039	KLAPPROTH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KATHERINE SALMON	1634	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 March 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *27-51 and 54* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *27-51, 54* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/13/2008 has been entered.

Claims 27-51 and 54 are pending. Claims 1-26, 52-53 have been cancelled. Response to Arguments follows each presented rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. The following 35 USC 102(b) rejections presented below is a reiteration of the 35 USC 102(b) presented in the final rejection (mailed 12/13/2007). Response to arguments present in the reply (3/13/2008) follows.

3. Claims 27-29, 31-32, 34-37, 41-44, 46, 49-51, and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kurane et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2001/0000148 A1 April 5, 2001).

With regard to Claim 27, Kurane et al. teaches immobilizing a probe on a solid support (preparing a carrier by immobilizing at least one receptor (e.g. a probe)) (p. 8 paragraph 161). Kurane et al. teaches forming a marker (florescent signal) and receptor (probe) complex (p. 8 paragraph 161). Kurane et al. teaches a processing step of analyzing the intensity of fluorescence emitted from the reaction system when the target is not hybridized to the probe (p. 7 paragraph 158), therefore, Kurane et al. teaches determining the number of receptors on the carrier by detecting the receptor-marker complex (i.e. the fluorescence emitted). Kurane et al. teaches that the probe can be immobilized to the solid surface and then labeled with a fluorescent dye prior to hybridization with the target (p. 8 paragraph 169).

With regard to Claims 28-29, Kurane et al. teaches adding a target sample (ligand) and measuring the hybridization of the receptor (probe) and target (ligand) by measuring the fluoresce intensity (e.g. examining the test sample) (p. 7 paragraph 158).

With regard to Claim 31, Kurane et al. teaches the receptor is nucleic acid (abstract).

With regard to Claim 32, Kurane et al. teaches that reaction temperature can be varied so that it can be low enough to allow all receptor and ligands to bind or it can be increased such that there is no hybridization (the receptor and ligand are separate) (p. 9 paragraph 174).

With regard to Claim 34, Kurane et al. teaches a method wherein Figure 6 discloses two markers associated with 2 receptors (e.g. equal number of markers and receptors).

With regard to Claims 35-37, Kurane et al. teaches that the marker can be a fluorescent dye such as rhodamine and tetramethylrhodamine (a reactive group) (p. 6 paragraph 144).

With regard to Claim 41, Kurane et al. teaches that FRET can be used (p. 10 paragraph 190).

With regard to Claim 42, Kurane et al. teaches that the binding of the ligand to the probe (receptor) reduces florescence therefor the interaction of the ligand modifies FRET (abstract).

With regard to Claim 43-44 and 46, Kurane et al. teaches that a probe labeled with a fluorescent dye quenches when a target is hybridized (p. 2 paragraph 19). Therefore the receptor contains a dye which acts as a donor and the is quenched by an acceptor. Further, Kurane et al. teaches that hybridization of the ligand brings the donor and the acceptor of FRET into contact because Kurane et al. teaches that the hybridization of the ligand to the receptor decreases fluorescence.

With regard to Claim 49, Kurane et al. teaches immobilizing a probe on a solid support (preparing a carrier by immobilizing at least one receptor (e.g. a probe)) (p. 8 paragraph 161). Kurane et al. teaches forming a marker (florescent signal) and receptor (probe) complex (p. 8 paragraph 161). Kurane et al. teaches a processing step of analyzing the intensity of fluorescence emitted from the reaction system when the

target is not hybridized to the probe (p. 7 paragraph 158), therefore, Kurane et al. teaches determining the number of receptors on the carrier by detecting the receptor-marker complex (i.e. the fluorescence emitted). Kurane et al. teaches that the marker can be a fluorescent dye such as tetramethylrhodamine (a reactive group) (p. 6 paragraph 144).

With regard to Claim 50, Kurane et al. teaches immobilizing a probe on a solid support (preparing a carrier by immobilizing at least one receptor (e.g. a probe)) (p. 8 paragraph 161). Kurane et al. teaches forming a marker (florescent signal) and receptor (probe) complex (p. 8 paragraph 161). Kurane et al. teaches a processing step of analyzing the intensity of fluorescence emitted from the reaction system when the target is not hybridized to the probe (p. 7 paragraph 158), therefore, Kurane et al. teaches determining the number of receptors on the carrier by detecting the receptor-marker complex (i.e. the fluorescence emitted).

With regard to Claim 51, Kurane et al. teaches coating the carrier with a polylysine prior to binding a receptor (preparing the carrier) (p. 8 paragraph 162).

With regard to Claim 54, Kurane et al. teaches adding a target sample (ligand) and measuring the hybridization of the receptor (probe) and target (ligand) by measuring the fluoresce intensity (detecting receptor-ligand complexes) (p. 7 paragraph 158).

Response to Arguments

The reply traverses the rejection. A summary of the arguments in the reply is presented below with response to arguments following.

The reply asserts that the claims are drawn to "binding a marker in contact with the receptor to form a receptor-marker complex with separable binding between the receptor and the marker" (p. 11 1st paragraph, last paragraph, and p. 12 2nd paragraph). The reply asserts that the art, Kurane et al, teaches markers that do not build a chemical complex but links covalently to the receptor (p. 11 2nd paragraph and p. 12 1st and 2nd paragraph). The reply asserts that Kurane et al. teaches that receptor is transformed chemically through the covalent bond and the specificity of the receptor of the ligand diminishes (p. 11 2nd paragraph and p. 12 1st and 2nd paragraph). The reply asserts that the instant claims require a receptor-marker complex formed with separable binding between the receptor and marker which is not found in Kurane et al. (p. 11 2nd paragraph and p. 12 1st and 2nd paragraph).

These arguments have been fully reviewed but have not been found persuasive.

The reply asserts that the covalent bond between the receptor and marker is not a separable binding. However, it is well know in the art that covalent bonds can be separated. Therefore the binding between the receptor and the marker can be removed by cleaving the marker from the receptor. The reply asserts that Kurane et al. is different from the instant application because the bonds between the ligand and receptor diminishes when there is a bond between the marker and the receptor, however, Kurane et al. teaches all the claimed steps therefore Kurane et al. teaches all the limitations of the claims. The instant claims do not require any specific binding between the receptor and the marker, only that the binding be able to separate. Covalent bonds can be broken and therefore the binding is separable. Further, Kurane

et al. teaches fluorescent markers which is the same as the claimed markers (claims 37). Therefore Kurane et al. teaches all the claimed limitations. Further the claims are drawn to immobilizing at least one receptor on the carrier where the at least one receptor interacts with a ligand to form a receptor-ligand complex and after immobilization of the at least one receptor on the carrier bringing a marker in contact with the receptor. The arguments seem to be asserting that the receptor-ligand complex must be formed before the receptor-marker complex, however, the claims as written merely require immobilization of the at least one receptor on the carrier before forming the receptor-marker complex.

4. Claims 33 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kurane et al. (US Patent Application Publication US 2011/0000148 A1 April 5, 2001) as applied to Claims 27-29, 31-32, 33-37, 41-44, 46, 49-52, and 54 and as evidence by Cremer et al. (US Patent 5922543 July 13, 1999).

Kurane et al. teaches immobilizing a probe on a solid support (preparing a carrier by immobilizing at least one receptor (e.g. a probe)) (p. 8 paragraph 161). Kurane et al. teaches forming a marker (florescent signal) and receptor (probe) complex (p. 8 paragraph 161). Kurane et al. teaches a processing step of analyzing the intensity of fluorescence emitted from the reaction system when the target is not hybridized to the probe (p. 7 paragraph 158), therefore, Kurane et al. teaches determining the number of receptors on the carrier by detecting the receptor-marker complex (i.e. the fluorescence emitted).

With regard to Claim 40, Kurane et al. teaches that the marker can be a fluorescent dye such as rhodamine and tetramethylrhodamine (a reactive group) (p. 6 paragraph 144). Cremer et al. teaches the half-life of rhodamine derivatives in the nanosecond range (Column 20 lines 4-6).

Response to Arguments

The reply traverses the rejection. A summary of the arguments in the reply is presented below with response to arguments following.

The reply asserts that the independent claims are not anticipated by Kurane et al. because Kurane et al. does not teach “binding a marker in contact with the receptor to form a receptor-marker complex with separable binding between the receptor and the marker"(p. 11 1st paragraph, last paragraph, and p. 12 2nd paragraph and p. 12 last paragraph). However, as presented in the response to arguments above Kurane et al. teaches binding a marker in contact with the receptor to form a receptor-marker complex with separable binding between the receptor and the marker". Therefore Kurane et al. teaches all the limitations to the independent claims of the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made

> to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurane et al. (US Patent Application Publication US 2011/0000148 A1 April 5, 2001) in view of Sosnowski et al. (US Patent 6051380 April 18, 2000).

Kurane et al. teaches immobilizing a probe on a solid support (preparing a carrier by immobilizing at least one receptor (e.g. a probe)) (p. 8 paragraph 161). Kurane et al. teaches forming a marker (florescent signal) and receptor (probe) complex (p. 8 paragraph 161). Kurane et al. teaches a processing step of analyzing the intensity of fluorescence emitted from the reaction system when the target is not hybridized to the probe (p. 7 paragraph 158), therefore, Kurane et al. teaches determining the number of

receptors on the carrier by detecting the receptor-marker complex (i.e. the fluorescence emitted).

However, Kurane et al. does not teach a carrier comprises of silicon, semimetal oxides, including SiO, and aluminum oxide.

Sosnowski et al. teaches the use of a carrier which is comprised of silicon (Column 9 lines 4-5).

Therefore it would have been prime facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Kurane et al. to use a silicon based carrier as taught by Sosnowski et al. The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to modify the method of Kurane et al. to use a silicon based carrier as taught by Sosnowski et al. because Sosnowksi et al. teaches that silicon layer provides a better chemical interface to provide a more stabile and robust carrier (Column 48 lines 20-28). The ordinary artisan would be motivated to produce a carrier, which is stabile and robust in order to produce a fabricated carrier comprising receptors, which could be used and stored easily without degradation.

Response to Arguments

The reply traverses the rejection. A summary of the arguments in the reply is presented below with response to arguments following.

The reply asserts that the independent claims are not anticipated by Kurane et al. because Kurane et al. does not teach “binding a marker in contact with the receptor to form a receptor-marker complex with separable binding between the receptor and the

marker"(p. 11 1st paragraph, last paragraph, and p. 12 2nd paragraph and p. 13 1st paragraph). However, as presented in the response to arguments above Kurane et al. teaches binding a marker in contact with the receptor to form a receptor-marker complex with separable binding between the receptor and the marker". Therefore Kurane et al. teaches all the limitations to the independent claims of the claimed invention.

7. Claims 38-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurane et al. (US Patent Application Publication US 2011/0000148 A1 April 5, 2001) in view of Laugharn, Jr. et al. (US Patent 6245506 June 12, 2001).

Kurane et al. teaches immobilizing a probe on a solid support (preparing a carrier by immobilizing at least one receptor (e.g. a probe)) (p. 8 paragraph 161). Kurane et al. teaches forming a marker (florescent signal) and receptor (probe) complex (p. 8 paragraph 161). Kurane et al. teaches a processing step of analyzing the intensity of fluorescence emitted from the reaction system when the target is not hybridized to the probe (p. 7 paragraph 158), therefore, Kurane et al. teaches determining the number of receptors on the carrier by detecting the receptor-marker complex (i.e. the fluorescence emitted).

However, Kurane et al. does not teach a marker comprising inherent fluorescence such as tryptophan.

With regard to Claims 38-39, Laugharn, Jr. et al. teaches a method using inherent fluorescence as labels (Column 13 lines 6-18). Laugharn Jr, et al. teaches that one of the labels can be tryptophan (Column 13 lines 6-18).

Therefore it would have been prime facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Kurane et al. to use a tryptophan label as taught by Laugharn Jr. et al. The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to modify the method of Kurane et al. to use a tryptophan label as taught by Laugharn Jr. et al., because Laugharn Jr. et al. teaches that labels such as tryptophan have a characteristic wavelength which can be detected without the need for separation of the product nucleotides from the substrate (Column 13 lines 6-18).

Response to Arguments

The reply traverses the rejection. A summary of the arguments in the reply is presented below with response to arguments following.

The reply asserts that the independent claims are not anticipated by Kurane et al. because Kurane et al. does not teach “binding a marker in contact with the receptor to form a receptor-marker complex with separable binding between the receptor and the marker"(p. 11 1st paragraph, last paragraph, and p. 12 2nd paragraph and p. 13 2nd paragraph). However, as presented in the response to arguments above Kurane et al. teaches binding a marker in contact with the receptor to form a receptor-marker complex with separable binding between the receptor and the marker". Therefore Kurane et al. teaches all the limitations to the independent claims of the claimed invention.

8. Claims 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurane et al. (US Patent Application Publication US 2011/0000148 A1 April 5, 2001) in view of Brenner et al. (US Patent 5695934 December 9, 1997)

Kurane et al. teaches immobilizing a probe on a solid support (preparing a carrier by immobilizing at least one receptor (e.g. a probe)) (p. 8 paragraph 161). Kurane et al. teaches forming a marker (florescent signal) and receptor (probe) complex (p. 8 paragraph 161). Kurane et al. teaches a processing step of analyzing the intensity of fluorescence emitted from the reaction system when the target is not hybridized to the probe (p. 7 paragraph 158), therefore, Kurane et al. teaches determining the number of receptors on the carrier by detecting the receptor-marker complex (i.e. the fluorescence emitted).

However, Kurane et al. does not teach a marker which is a microparticle.

With regard to Claims 48, Brenner et al. teaches microparticles used as fluorescent labels (Column 20 lines 30-45).

Therefore it would have been prime facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Kurane et al. to use a microparticle labels as taught by Brenner et al. The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to modify the method of Kurane et al. to use a microparticle label as taught by Brenner et al., because Brenner et al. teaches that microparticles permit resolution on a plane at a density between about ten thousand to one hundred thousand microparticles

(column 20 lines 30-45). The ordinary artisan would be motivated to use microparticles in order to detect as many receptors as possible immobilized on the carrier.

Response to Arguments

The reply traverses the rejection. A summary of the arguments in the reply is presented below with response to arguments following.

The reply asserts that the independent claims are not anticipated by Kurane et al. because Kurane et al. does not teach “binding a marker in contact with the receptor to form a receptor-marker complex with separable binding between the receptor and the marker"(p. 11 1st paragraph, last paragraph, and p. 12 2nd paragraph and p. 13 last paragraph). However, as presented in the response to arguments above Kurane et al. teaches binding a marker in contact with the receptor to form a receptor-marker complex with separable binding between the receptor and the marker". Therefore Kurane et al. teaches all the limitations to the independent claims of the claimed invention.

Conclusion

No Claims are allowed.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Katherine Salmon whose telephone number is (571) 272-3316. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8AM-430PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ram Shukla can be reached on (571) 272-0735. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Katherine Salmon
Examiner
Art Unit 1634

/Ram R. Shukla/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1634